



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,568	06/29/2000	Steve Mattis	10004010-1	8523

7590 08/02/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Handwritten signature/initials

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten number 3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/607,568

Applicant(s)

MATTIS ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher J Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 6.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2134

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 1 and 6, The applicant argues that Brown fails to show the From field is locked. The examiner points to figure 13.9, where the user is creating an email to be sent. The From field is not shown because it is already locked and not editable. The client recognizes the appropriate From field after the user has entered their account through an authentication process as shown in figure 13.7. The From field is not shown in figure 13.9 because it is locked, and its presence on the screen would take needed space. The field is still present, and shown in the received email in fig 13.13 (). It would be apparent that a From field in an email system is not editable, and therefore locked.

As per claim 5, The Examiner points to Garrison for the authentication of a user.

Garrison discloses a Client with a processor (DSP) and memory (disk) coupled to a local network (network interface), (Col 3 lines 53-65). Garrison discloses logic to input a password associated with a user, (Col 4 lines 28, 29, Col 5 lines 4-8). Garrison discloses logic to authenticate the password, (Col 6 lines 3-18).

The Garrison-Brown combination as stated in the previous rejection, obtains the From field through the authentication logic. Without the authentication, the email cannot be accessed, and no from field will be obtained.

As per claims 14, 19, and 24, The applicant argues that Lee fails to show that a Form field identifier is obtained from an electronic mail server based upon a secure identification tag. The Examiner points to Garrison for the authentication of a user as a secure identification tag

Garrison discloses a Client with a processor (DSP) and memory (disk) coupled to a local network (network interface), (Col 3 lines 53-65). Garrison discloses logic to input a password associated with a user, (Col 4 lines 28, 29, Col 5 lines 4-8). Garrison discloses logic to authenticate the password, (Col 6 lines 3-18).

Garrison does not disclose a FROM field.

The Examiner points to Brown to show a locked From field based upon a secure identification.

Brown discloses authenticating a user with a password, (Pg 226 paragraph 1)

Brown discloses obtaining a from field identifier, and locking the from field identifier into a from field associated with data transmission, (Ray Gronberg gornberg@nando.net) associated with the user, (page 342 figure 13.13).

The Examiner points to Lee as further evidence of logging in for authentication (Col 7 lines 19-30), wherein the system will automatically request the from field based upon said authentication, (Col 7 lines 35-50).

Art Unit: 2134

The Examiner points to the well known IMAP protocol and DECUS slides 69, 70, and 72. The well-known IMAP email protocol provides for recovering said from field. The IMAP protocol provides online email accounts wherein a user must log in to an email server, (Slide 69, Authentication). Once client is authenticated to access their email account, the user has a security tag, and multiple privileges, (slide 70, 72, unique identifier, read write). Once a user is authenticated, upon creating a message, the From field will automatically be added to said message, and sent upon the users approval. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Garrison, Brown, Lee, and IMAP email, because a remote server allows email access from anywhere.

Rejections for all other claims can be found from the previous office action, included below:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrison US 6,336,114 in view of Brown "Using Netscape 2".

As per claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24 and 25, Garrison discloses a Client with a processor (DSP) and memory (disk) coupled to a local network (network interface), (Col 3 lines 53-65).

Art Unit: 2134

Garrison discloses logic to input a password associated with a user, (Col 4 lines 28, 29, Col 5 lines 4-8). Garrison discloses logic to authenticate the password, (Col 6 lines 3-18).

Garrison does not disclose a FROM field.

Brown discloses authenticating a user with a password, (Pg 226 paragraph 1)

Brown discloses obtaining a from field identifier, and locking the from field identifier into a from field associated with data transmission, (Ray Gronberg gornberg@nando.net) associated with the user, (page 342 figure 13.13).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Garrison with Brown because the authentication method of Garrison makes the email of Brown more secure.

As per claims 2, 7, and 12, Garrison discloses logic to input a username, (Col 5 lines 4-8).

As per claims 3, and 8, Garrison does not disclose a from field.

Brown discloses a from field with the name of the user, (Ray Gronberg), (page 342 figure 13.13).

As per claims 4, and 9, Garrison does not disclose a from field.

Brown discloses a from field with an electronic mail address associated with the user, (gornberg@nando.net), (page 342 figure 13.13).

As per claims 5, 10, and 13, Garrison discloses logic to encrypt the password, (Col 5 lines 20-23).

Garrison discloses logic to authenticate the user and password, (Col 6 lines 3-18). Garrison does not disclose a from field.

Brown discloses a from field, (Figure 13.13).

As per claims 16, 21, and 26, Garrison discloses authentication requires decryption of the password, (Col 6 lines 3-10).

Claims 17, 22, and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrison US 6,336,114 in view of Brown "Using Netscape 2" in view of Misra US 5,742,769

As per claims 17, 22, and 27, Garrison-Brown does not disclose a domain controller.

Misra discloses using a domain controller to verify a password (authenticate), (Col 4 lines 45-65).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Garrison-Brown with Misra because the authentication service increases security.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 18, 23, and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrison US 6,336,114 in view of Brown "Using Netscape 2" in view of Lee US 5,742,769.

As per claims 18, 23, and 28, the Garrison Brown combination does not disclose requesting the From field from a server.

Lee discloses requesting the from field from a server, (Col 7 lines 35-50).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Garrison-Brown with Lee, because a remote server allows email access from anywhere.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-8023. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

A stylized, handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large 'C' followed by a series of loops and a final 'B'.

Andrew Caldwell
Andrew Caldwell